



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,951	01/04/2001	Marvin L. Vestal	SYP-060REC N	4499

7590 11/29/2001

Patent Administrator
Testa Hurwitz & Thibault LLP
125 High Street
Boston, MA 02110

EXAMINER

SODERQUIST, ARLEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1743

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2001

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/755,951

Applicant(s)

Vestal

Examiner

Arlen Soderquist

Group Art Unit

1743



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Arlen Soderquist

(3) Michael H. Brodowski

(2) Michael J. Bastian

(4) _____

Date of Interview Nov 15, 2001

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: the independent claims

Identification of prior art discussed:

the applied references

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed the rejections applied against the claims. Applicant urged that there is basis in the specification for the instant claim language. Examiner pointed out that if basis is in the specification the figures do not show the instantly claimed structure. Applicant urged that additional structure is not needed. Examiner explained that the wherein clause in the independent claims is being treated as functional rather than structural. Relative to the art rejection applicant urged that the art fails to teach or suggest the sample transport mechanism in combination with the fluid communication between the vacuum lock and source chamber as found in the wherein clause. Examiner pointed out that the Wilhemi reference applied shows fluid communication between the two chambers shown in figure 3 of that reference, but does not clearly teach that this is the case. However, a translation of the Wilhemi report has been obtained and will be considered to try and determine if that is actually the case or if the push rod blocks fluid communication as it moved a sample into the ion source

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Arlen Soderquist

ARLEN SODERQUIST
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.